

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

(G. O. Rt. No. 115/AIL/Lab./J/2010, dated 27th May 2010)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in I.D. No. 36/2008, dated 4-3-2010 of the Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Sri Bharathi Mills and Anna Thozhilalar Union-over non-allotment of light work to the ailing heart patient Thiru R.V. Iyyanarayappan has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G. O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the official gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
Joint Secretary to Government (Labour).

**BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT (II ADDITIONAL
DISTRICT JUDGE) AT PONDICHERRY**

Present : Thiru E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR, M.A., B.L.,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
Pondicherry.

Thursday, the 4th day of March 2010.

I.D. No. 36/2008

The President,
M/s. Anna Thozhilalar Union,
Bharathi Mills, Mudaliarpet,
Puducherry – 605 004 . . . Petitioner.

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Sri Bharathi Mills,
Mudaliarpet, Puducherry – 605 004 . . . Respondent.

This industrial dispute coming on this day for hearing before me, the petitioner and his counsel called absent, Thiru K. Ravikumar, Advocate for the respondent and after perusing the case records, this court passed the following:

ORDER

This industrial dispute has been referred to this court by the Government of Pondicherry, *vide* G. O. Rt. No. 159/AIL/Lab./J/2008, dated 3-12-2008 of the Labour Department, Pondicherry to resolve the following disputes:

(a) Whether the dispute raised by Anna Thozhilalar Union against the management of M/s. Sri Bharathi Mills, Puducherry over non-allotment of light work to the ailing heart patient Thiru R.V. Iyyanarayappan is justified or not?

(b) If justified, what relief, the petitioner is entitled to? Give appropriate directions?

2. The industrial dispute was taken on file on 16-12-2008. On 23-1-2009, fresh notice was ordered to both the parties. Form-F for the respondent was filed on 23-7-2009 and the case was posted to 6-8-2009 for appearance of petitioner. Thereafter the case was adjourned for about 9 (nine) hearings on the following dates : 10-9-2009, 22-10-2009, 26-11-2009, 10-12-2009, 17-12-2009, 7-1-2010, 21-1-2010, 4-2-2010, 18-2-2010, for appearance of the petitioner. Unfortunately the petitioner is a labour, who claims to have been victimised by the respondent company, but the petitioner shows no interest in proceeding with the case. On the other hand he has exceeded the time limit stipulated under the Industrial Disputes Act. The industrial dispute is pending for 1 year 2½ months (one year and two and a half months) from 16-12-2008 to 4-3-2010. Despite sufficient opportunities given, the petitioner did not choose to appear before court. This shows that the petitioner would have got employment in some other company and hence has lost interest in the matter. Further, the Industrial Disputes Act, requires that a dispute should be resolved within 6 months (six months). Hence this court finds that there is no point in having the case pending on file and the industrial dispute is liable to be dismissed.

3. In the result, the industrial disputes is dismissed.

Typed to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court, on this the 4th day of March 2010.

E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Pondicherry.

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

(G.O. Rt. No. 117/AIL/Lab./J/2010, dated 4th June 2010)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in I.D. No. 33/2008, dated 8-4-2010 of the Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Swadeshi Cotton Mills (NTC) and Swadeshi Panchalai Thozhilalar Urimai Padukappu Sangam, Puducherry over date of joining of 25 workmen has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the Notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the official gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
Joint Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT (II ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE) AT PONDICHERRY

Present : Thiru E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR, M.A., B.L., II Additional District Judge, Presiding Officer, Labour Court. Pondicherry.

Thursday, the 8th day of April 2010.

I.D. No. 33/2008

The President,
Swadeshi Panchalai Thozhilalar Urimai
Padukappu Sangam, Pondicherry. . . Petitioner.

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Swadeshi Mills,
Pondicherry. . . Respondent.

This industrial dispute coming on this day for hearing before me, the petitioner and his counsel Tmt. S. Lalitha called absent, Thiru K. Ravikumar, Advocate for the respondent and after perusing the case records, this court passed the following:

ORDER

This industrial dispute has been referred to this court by the Government of Pondicherry, *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 151/AIL/Lab./J/2008, dated 13-10-2008 of the Labour Department, Pondicherry to resolve the following disputes:

(a) Whether the dispute raised by Swadeshi Panchalai Thozhilalar Urimai Padukappu Sangam against the management of M/s. Swadeshi Cotton Mills, Puducherry for change of date of joining of 25 workers, Thiruvalargal 1. R. Balasegar, 2. S. Srinivasan, 3. S. Nagansundaram, 4. P. Paramasivam, 5. K. Kalianasundaran, 6. M. Thanappan, 7. V. Kothandapani, 8. V. Veeraselvam, 9. R. Munisamy, 10. R. Janakiraman, 11. K. Neelakandan, 12. M. Patturaja, 13. Samuvel, 14. S. Kasinathan, 15. K. Kalianam, 16. E. Kalidass, 17. M. Chandirasegaran, 18. P. Vinayamurthy, 19. S. Natarajan, 20. K. Mannakatty, 21. T. Veerappan, 22. M. Ramesh, 23. M. Jayavelu, 24. K. Kaliyamurthy and 25. S. Subramanian is justified or not?

(b) To what relief, they are entitled to ? Give appropriate directions ?

2. The industrial dispute was taken on file on 22-10-2008. Form-F for the respondent was filed on 21-11-2008 and the case was posted to 11-12-2008 for filing of claim statement. Thereafter the case was adjourned for about 18 (eighteen) hearings on the following dates : 29-1-2009, 5-3-2009, 16-4-2009, 18-6-2009, 16-7-2009, 23-7-2009, 6-8-2009, 10-9-2009, 22-10-2009, 26-11-2009, 10-12-2009, 17-12-2009, 28-1-2010, 11-2-2010 for filing claim statement, on 25-2-2010 and again on 4-3-2010, the case was posted for dismissal. Subsequently, on 11-3-2010 petition for adjournment was filed which was allowed and posted for dismissal, again on 25-3-2010, another petition praying for adjournment was filed and allowed and the case was posted for dismissal and for filing of claim statement. The court in spite of granting two times adjournment on request made by the petitioner's counsel through petition, the petitioner instead of filing the claim statement cleverly acted and engaged another counsel for filing Form-F and prayed for extension of time for filing claim statement. Unfortunately the petitioner is a labour, who claims to have been victimised by the respondent company, but the petitioner himself is not ready to file claim statement and proceed with the case. On the other hand he has exceeded the time limit stipulated under the Industrial Disputes Act. The industrial dispute is pending for 1 year 5½ months (one year and five and a half months) from 22-10-2008 to 8-4-2010. Despite sufficient opportunities given, the petitioner did not choose to file the claim statement. This shows that the petitioner would have got employment in some other company and hence has lost interest in the matter or that, he has no grievance against the respondent. Further, the Industrial Disputes Act, requires that a dispute should be resolved within 6 months (six months). Hence this court finds that there is no point in having the case pending on file and the industrial dispute is liable to be dismissed.

3. In the result, the industrial dispute is dismissed.

Typed to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 8th day of April, 2010.

E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Pondicherry.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 118/AIL/Lab./J/2010, dated 4th June 2010)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in I.D. No.26/2007, dated 4-3-2010 of the Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute between Somkan Staff and Workers Union and the management of M/s. Somkan Marine Foods Limited, Yanam regarding the change of service conditions has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No.20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the official gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
Joint Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT (II ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE) AT PONDICHERRY

Present : Thiru E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR, M.A., B.L.,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
Pondicherry.

Thursday, the 4th day of March 2010.

I.D. No. 26/2007

K.S. Chakaravarthy,
President, Somkan Staff
Workers Union,
No. 8/321, 1st Cross Street,
Zicrianagar . . . Petitioner.

Versus

The Managing Director,
M/s. Somkan Marine Foods Limited,
Adavipolam, Yanam . . . Respondent.

This industrial dispute coming on this day for hearing before me the petitioner and his counsel called absent. Thiru L. Satish and S. Doraisamy Advocates for the respondent, upon hearing both sides, after perusing the case records, this court passed the following :

ORDER

This industrial dispute has been referred to this court by the Government of Pondicherry. *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 100/2007/Lab./AIL/J, dated 21-5-2007 of the Labour Department, Pondicherry to resolve the following disputes :—

(a) Whether the change of service conditions notified under section 9-A by the management of M/s. Somkan Marine Foods Limited, Yanam is in accordance with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?

(b) If not, to what remedies, the workers are entitled to?

(c) To compute the relief, if any, awarded in terms of money, if it can be so computed?

2. The industrial dispute was taken on file on 4-6-2007. On 6-7-2007 notice was ordered to both parties and Form-F for the respondent was filed. The petitioner was called absent and no representation was made on behalf of him. Vakalat or Form-F has not been filed. Thereafter, the case was adjourned for about 33 (thirty-three) hearings on the following dates: 9-8-2007, 11-10-2007, 15-11-2007, 8-2-2008, 10-4-2008, 6-6-2008, 7-8-2008, 13-10-2008, 21-10-2008, 13-11-2008, 21-11-2008, 4-12-2008, 18-12-2008, 22-1-2009, 26-2-2009, 2-4-2009, 4-6-2009, 18-6-2009, 9-7-2009, 16-7-2009, 23-7-2009, 6-8-2009, 10-9-2009, 22-10-2009, 5-11-2009, 12-11-2009, 26-11-2009, 10-12-2009, 17-12-2009, 21-1-2010, 4-2-2010, 11-2-2010, 25-2-2010 for appearance of the petitioner. The industrial dispute is pending for two years and eight months from 6-7-2007 to 4-3-2010. Despite sufficient opportunities given, the petitioner neither appeared before this court nor made any representation. This shows that the petitioner has lost interest in the matter and there is no point in having the case pending on file and the industrial dispute is liable to be dismissed.

3. In the result, petition is dismissed.

Typed to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 4th day of March 2010.

E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Pondicherry.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 119/AIL/Lab./J/2010, dated 7th June 2010)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in I.D. No.6/2005, dated 25-3-2010 of the Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Cadila Pharmaceuticals Limited, Ahamedabad (Head-quarters) and its workman Thiru S. Ravi - over the claim of employment with back wages and continuity of service has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the official gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
Joint Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT AT PONDICHERRY

Present : Thiru E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR, M.A., B.L.,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
Pondicherry.

Thursday, the 25th day of March 2010.

I.D. No. 6/2005

S. Ravi . . . Petitioner.
Versus

The General Manager,
Cadila Pharmaceuticals Limited,
Ahamedabad, Gujarat. . . Respondent.

This industrial dispute coming on this day for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru. S. Mukundan, counsel for the petitioner, Thiru S. Satish, Advocate for the respondent, upon perusing the case records, this court passed the following :

AWARD

This industrial dispute arises out of the reference made by the Labour Department, Government of Pondicherry *vide* G.O. Rt. No.158/2004/Lab./AIL/J, dated 20-12-2004 for adjudication of the following industrial dispute :—

(a) Whether the transfer of Thiru S. Ravi, Sales Promotion Employee from Pondicherry Head-quarters to Ahamedabad Head quarters by M/s. Cadila Pharmaceuticals Limited, Ahamedabad is justified or not?

(b) Whether the claim of employment of Thiru S. Ravi with back wages and continuity of service from the management of Cadila Pharmaceuticals Limited, Ahamedabad is justified or not?

(c) To what relief/remedies he is entitled to?

(d) To compute the relief if any, awarded in terms of money, if it can be so computed?

2. On the side of the petitioner, the claim statement was filed on 16-3-2007. Then the matter was posted for filing of counter by the respondent to 9-8-2007, 13-9-2007, 15-11-2007, 24-1-2008, 20-3-2008, 12-6-2008, 7-8-2008, 13-10-2008, 11-12-2008, 9-1-2008, 19-2-2009, 19-3-2009, 23-4-2009, 11-6-2009, 25-6-2009, 23-7-2009, 6-8-2009, 10-9-2009, 22-10-2009, 26-11-2009, 3-12-2009, 17-12-2009, 7-1-2010, 21-1-2010 and 4-2-2010. But for the past 3 (three) years in 25 (twenty-five) hearings, no counter filed on the side of the respondent and even there was no representation on their side. On 11-3-2010 the petitioner filed his chief proof affidavit and he was examined as PW1 and marked Ex.P1 to Ex.PI0. Satisfied. Claim proved.

3. Hence, the industrial dispute is allowed and the transfer of petitioner from Pondicherry to Ahamedabad Headquarters by the respondent is not justified and the respondent is hereby directed to reinstate the petitioner with full back wages and continuity of service. However, there is no order as to costs.

Typed to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 25th day of March, 2010.

E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Pondicherry.

List of witnesses marked for the petitioner :

PW 1 — 4-3-2010 — S. Ravi.

List of exhibits marked for the petitioner:

Ex.P1 — Copy of the letter of appointment,
dated 19-6-1981.

Ex.P2 — Copy of the letter issued to the
petitioner, dated nil.

- Ex.P3 — Copy of the letter issued to the petitioner, dated 9-2-2002.
- Ex.P4 — Copy of the letter, dated 19-3-2002 issued to the petitioner.
- Ex.P5 — Copy of the letter, dated 15-6-2002 issued to the petitioner.
- Ex.P6 — Copy of the letter, dated 14-5-2003 issued by the respondent to C.O.
- Ex.P7 — Copy of the letter, dated 14-5-2003 issued by the respondent to petitioner.
- Ex.P8 — Copy of the letter, dated 17-7-2003 issued by the respondent to C.O.
- Ex.P9 — Copy of the letter issued by the respondent to C.O., dated 21-8-2003.
- Ex.PI0 — Incentive payment receipts 8 in numbers to the petitioner.

E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Pondicherry.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 125/AIL/Lab./J/2010, dated 10th June 2010)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in I.D. No.22/2006, dated 11-3-2010 of the Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Suresoft Systems Private Limited, Puducherry and Thiru A.Sivapragasam over his non-employment has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the official gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
Joint Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT (II ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE) AT PONDICHERRY

Present : Thiru E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR, M.A., B.L., II Additional District Judge, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Pondicherry.

Thursday, the 11th day of March 2010

I.D. No. 22/2006

A. Sivapragasam .. Petitioner.

Versus

The Managing Director,
Suresoft Systems Private Limited,
Plot Nos. 11 and 12, 3rd Cross,
Sivaganga Nagar, Anna Nagar Extension,
Pondicherry-605 005. .. Respondent.

This industrial dispute coming on this day for hearing before me the petitioner and his counsel Mrs. C.K. Ajitha Kumary, called absent. Thiruvalargal R.S. Zivanandam, D. Ravichandran and S. Ashok Kumar, advocates for the respondent, upon hearing both sides, after perusing the case records, this court passed the following:

ORDER

This industrial dispute has been referred to this court by the Government of Pondicherry, *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 120/2006/Lab./AIL/J, dated 31-7-2006 of the Labour Department, Pondicherry to resolve the following disputes:

- (a) Whether the non-employment of Thiru A. Sivapragasam by the management of M/s. Suresoft Systems Private Limited, Pondicherry is justified or not?
- (b) To what relief, he is entitled to?
- (c) To compute the relief, if any, awarded in terms of money, if it can be so computed?

2. The industrial dispute was taken on file on 2-8-2006. Vakalat for the petitioner and Form-F for the respondent has been filed on 8-9-2006 and the case was posted 20-11-2006 for claim statement. Claim statement was filed on 14-6-2007 and counter statement on 10-4-2008. Thereafter the case was adjourned for about 22 (twenty-two) hearings on the following dates: 26-6-2008, 14-8-2008, 21-10-2008, 15-12-2008, 9-1-2009, 19-2-2009, 19-3-2009,

30-4-2009, 16-7-2009, 23-7-2009, 6-8-2009, 10-9-2009, 22-10-2009, 26-11-2009, 10-12-2009, 17-12-2009, 7-1-2010, 21-1-2010, 4-2-2010, 11-2-2010, 25-2-2010, 4-3-2010 for enquiry and for appearance of petitioner. The industrial dispute is pending for three years and six months from 8-9-2006 to 11-3-2010. Despite sufficient opportunities given, the petitioner did not appear before court and no representation was made on his behalf. This shows that the petitioner has lost interest in the matter and there is no point in having the case pending on file and the industrial dispute is liable to be dismissed.

3. In the result, petition is dismissed.

Typed to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court, on this the 11th day of March 2010.

E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Pondicherry.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 126/AIL/Lab./J/2010, dated 10th June 2010)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Award in I.D. No.32/2007, dated 4-3-2010 of the Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Somkan Marine Foods Limited, Yanam and Thiru K.S. Chakravarthy, President of Somkan Staff and Workers Union over non-payment of enhanced subsistence allowance has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G. O. Ms. No.20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-5-1991, It is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said Award shall be published in the official gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
Joint Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT (II ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE) AT PONDICHERRY

Present : Thiru E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR, M.A., B.L.,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
Pondicherry.

Thursday, the 4th day of March 2010

I.D. No. 32/2007

K.S. Chakravarthy,
Somkan Staff and Workers Union,
Zicria Nagar, Yanam. . . Petitioner.

Versus

The Management,
M/s. Somkan Marine Foods Limited,
Adavipolam, Yanam. . . Respondent.

This industrial dispute coming on this day for hearing before me the petitioner and his counsel called absent, Thiru L. Satish, advocate for the respondent, upon hearing both sides, after perusing the case records, this court passed the following:

ORDER

This industrial dispute has been referred to this court by the Government of Pondicherry, *vide* G.O. Rt.No. 148/2007/Lab./AIL/J, dated 6-11-2007 of the Labour Deparment, Pondicherry to resolve the following disputes:

(a) Whether Thiru K.S.Chakravarthy, who was employed by the management of M/s. Somkan Marine Foods Limited, Yanam and presently under suspension is a workman?

(b) Whether the demand of the said employee for payment of enhanced subsistence allowance is justified? If so, to what relief he is entitled to?

(c) Whether the demand of the said employee for the payment of bonus from the years 2000 to 2004 and 2005-06 is justified? If so, to give appropriate direction?

(d) Whether the demand of the said employee for payment of enhanced number of increment is justified? If so, to give appropriate direction?

2. The industrial dispute was taken on file on 13-11-2007. Form-F for the respondent was filed on 14-12-2007 and posted to 8-2-2008 for the petitioner's side. Thereafter the case was adjourned for about 28 (twenty-eight) hearings on the following

dates: 10-4-2008, 10-7-2008, 1-8-2008, 16-9-2008, 22-10-2008, 18-11-2008, 18-12-2008, 22-1-2009, 5-2-2009, 5-3-2009, 26-3-2009, 24-4-2009, 11-6-2009, 9-7-2009, 23-7-2009, 6-8-2009, 10-9-2009, 22-10-2009, 5-11-2009, 12-11-2009, 26-11-2009, 10-12-2009 for appearance of the petitioner and on 17-12-2009, 7-1-2010, 21-1-2010, 4-2-2010, 11-2-2010, 25-2-2010 for appearance of the petitioner or for dismissal. The industrial dispute is pending for 2 years and 3½ months (two years and three and a half months) from 13-11-2007 to 4-3-2010. Unfortunately the petitioner is a labour, who claims to have been victimised by the respondent company, but the petitioner himself is not ready to file claim statement and proceed with the case. On the other hand he has exceeded the time limit stipulated under the Industrial Disputes Act. Despite sufficient opportunities given, the petitioner did not choose to file the claim statement. This shows that the petitioner would have got employment in some other company and hence has lost interest in the matter. Further, the Industrial Disputes Act, requires that a dispute should be resolved within 6 months (six months). Hence this court finds that there is no point in having the case pending on file and the industrial dispute is liable to be dismissed.

3. In the result, the industrial dispute is dismissed.

Typed to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court, on this the 4th day of March 2010.

E.M.K.S. SIDDHARTHAR,
II Additional District Judge,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Pondicherry.

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(GO. Rt. No. 121/AIL/Lab.J/2010, dated 8th June 2010)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute has arisen between the management of M/s. Hindustan Unilever Limited Detergents Factory, Puducherry and Thiru R. Muthukrishnan over non-employment in respect of the matter mentioned in the Annexure to this order;

And whereas, in the opinion of the Government, it is necessary to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority delegated *vide* G. O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab., dated 23-5-1991 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to exercise the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said dispute be referred

powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said dispute be referred to the Labour Court, Puducherry for adjudication. The Labour Court, Puducherry shall submit the award within 3 months from the date of issue of reference as stipulated under sub-section (2-A) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and in accordance with rule 10-B of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957. The party raising the dispute shall file a statement of claim complete with relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses to the Labour Court, Puducherry within 15 days of the receipt of the order of reference and also forward a copy of such statement to each one of the opposite parties involved in the dispute.

ANNEXURE

(a) Whether the dispute raised by Thiru R. Muthukrishnan against the management of M/s. Hindustan Unilever Limited Detergents Factory, Puducherry, over non-employment is justified or not?

(b) If justified, to what relief, the petitioner is entitled to?

(c) To compute the relief, if any awarded in terms of money, if it can be so computed?

(By order)

G. MALAR KANNAN,
Joint Secretary to Government (Labour)

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(GO. Rt. No. 122/AIL/Lab.J/2010, dated 8th June 2010)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, the Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute has arisen between M/s. Vinayaka Mission's Medical College and Hospital, Karaikal and Thiru A. Arul Doss over non-employment in respect of the matter mentioned in the Annexure to this order;

And whereas, in the opinion of the Government, it is necessary to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority delegated *vide* G. O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab., dated 23-5-1991 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to exercise the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said dispute be referred